

ISSUES & EVENTS

Vol. 2, number 9 November 12, 1970

■ Registration Reaction, page 2

■ Quebec ID cards, page 3

HIS IMPACT



De Gaulle is above all a cultural figure. He is inconceivable as an Englishman or German or American; as a coincidence his name is Charles of Gaul. He is a Frenchman in a profound cultural sense. You may see him as a kind of Joan of Arc and Napoleon rolled into one, in terms of the spirit of the man. For that reason his impact on the world must be understood not in terms of French politics, if by politics one means the particular balance of combination of forces of the time. De Gaulle wanted above all to make France independent in a special sense: independent of rival cultural influences. Not a shut-in kind of autonomy, rather an autonomy that seeks a mission in the world. Those values are the French culture which the French call "la civilisation française".

In his speech here which ended with "Vive le Québec libre", what he meant was not, I think, some particular political arrangement of the Canadian structure, but the conviction that French and Anglo-Saxon cultures are unmixable. In a sense, he was seeking for Quebec the autonomy and cultural freedom that he sought when France was occupied, really debased. He was encouraging the Québécois to think of themselves as Frenchmen, not Frenchmen with political allegiance and taxes to pay to France, but culturally; insofar as the culture of France expresses or reflects a profound drive towards self-expression, towards the idea that every individual has infinite value. He felt that this value could be achieved through a process of acculturation and that this process is independent from matters moral and temporal.

These were his values when he was alone in England. Churchill's famous statement, "Of all the crosses I've had to bear, the Cross of Lorraine is the heaviest" meant that de Gaulle was in effect not considering the question of fighting Germany so much as that France should be in Germany fighting Germans with the Allies so that she could partake as a great power.

In the occupation of Germany and the settlement of the peace, France had a right historically, irrespective of the distribution of forces at any given time. This right came from a historic mission, from what she as a people had given to make up Western civilization.

The impact of this on the Third World would be enormous. Part of the Third World's problem in terms of trying to achieve industrialization and a modicum of material well-being to support their population is one of cultural achievement. The indigenous cultures of many of the areas of the Third World have been severely shaken by the experiences of imperialism, colonization and now decolonization. The very process of industrialization, even where that has not been shaken, is often very traumatic. By expressing this enormous sense of independence at any cost, de Gaulle is saying to the Third World: your freedom is like our freedom, independent of the arrangement of forces and the achievement on

the ladder of industrialization.

There is no question that from the point of view of policy the greatness of France needed to be supported by keeping her position in the industrial world with respect to the "force de frappe" - the nuclear effort. Technocracy is evident in all the efforts of France. All of this he favored and encouraged, but not as an expression of American culture and certainly never as an end in themselves. You need this as a means to throw your weight around in the world for a purpose, and that purpose is "la civilisation française". And those are the values, the expression of which he conceived, and Frenchmen conceive as being their particular rôle, which you see evidence of in Quebec. For the problem here is a cultural one, and that problem is what de Gaulle symbolizes more than anyone else in the world, in my opinion. This is true of his life, which was that of a lonely man. He was the incarnation of something which he felt was apolitical.

No Frenchman, however much he may have hated de Gaulle, would ever accuse him of lack of integrity. You never find de Gaulle's hand in the till or involved in something for private profit. This integrity extends also to his war career, his political career, where he would not compromise. That is the meaning of the Churchill statement. He was just so stubborn and always had considerations which were non-military in essence. Rather than attack Strasbourg, for example, as the military plan called for, he had the military forces fight in Germany, although it really made no difference. In every respect the massive integrity that he showed in domestic terms was coupled with detachment. He conceived himself to be profoundly apolitical.

Lionel Rothkrug

Lionel Rothkrug, a professor of History specializing in the History of Modern Europe, gives his impressions of the impact of Charles de Gaulle. Professor Rothkrug makes it clear that these are, in his own words, "off the top of my head".





I find it difficult to believe that the history of the Post-war period would have been entirely the same without de Gaulle. Without de Gaulle France probably would have gone Communist immediately. It was only he who headed them off. Without de Gaulle marching down the Champs Elysee at the liberation of Paris, it would have been the Communists. Without de Gaulle there would have been no Vietnam war, because 80,000-odd troops after the War went immediately into Indo-China. It's very difficult to visualize him as a speaker for anti-colonialism when Vietnam has its origins in the French return to Indo-China, under the sole driving force of Charles de Gaulle.

He showed courage and independence in the Cuban affair for saying you cannot let yourselves be blackmailed by the Russians. While I don't think the West would have let itself be blackmailed with or without de Gaulle's statement, I do think that his courage and independence had an effect on areas of, say, eastern Europe, like certain Balkan countries which had long traditions with France. The relationships of these countries to France are reflected in their desire for independence from Russia, intensified by the lone and independent position of France. For France stands in a sense towards the United States in the same way as many of the Balkan countries stand towards Russia. If he can pull out of NATO, why can't Roumania or Czechoslovakia pull out of or at least find some elbow room in the Warsaw Pact? It's not a matter of this being a policy, but room for a culture to breathe.

The business of a united Europe is more complicated. There is more involved than the pooling of economic resources. For if Britain were brought into the continent, there would be a problem of political leadership. France has political hegemony on the continent. This hegemony is a way in which the French cultural dominance in the context of which we have been speaking is implemented politically. De Gaulle's sorrow, apart from any personal scars or grudges he may have had during World War II, is that by bringing England into the continent, are you also bringing in America by the back door? There must be some way of implementing this without sacrificing the cultural-cum-political autonomy that he sought, not only for France but for Europe from Paris through to Moscow. What he was seeking was a Europe independent in her variety. While it has elements of what you might call a nationalism of a past age, I don't think it is entirely fair to characterize it as exclusively that. There are elements of simply not wanting to be transformed into interchangeable parts of a world industrial machine. There are elements here of a need to breathe in the collective sense that young people feel when they are against the establishment. They're caught up in a process where you can't put the responsibility anywhere or point a finger toward anything; it's just that you feel no control over your own destiny.

Insofar as de Gaulle expresses this cultural drive, Gaullism will last. He didn't invent it. It is because de Gaulle is a Frenchman, because this is something profound in France, that he is only a distinguished exponent. In this matter I don't think France will be much different after de Gaulle than before. Clearly with Pompidou, you are dealing with a much more traditional politician, not a napoleonic charismatic figure. But this does not mean that he is not motivated by the same forces as de Gaulle. After all, they received very similar educations. I don't think whether de Gaulle died today or twenty years from now, France would have acted differently in any given situation. It is clear that since 1789 France's problems with the exercise and establishment of political authority have not been solved. I don't think his death or remaining life would have changed anything in the future. He was an expression of something quite permanent in France. That is not to deny the importance of personalities in history. In the case of Algeria, civil war may well have come to France were it not for de Gaulle. Were it not for de Gaulle during the German occupation of France, France might well not occupy the position she did after World War II; she would have sunk much lower. But the power of personality is given its effectiveness by the very nature of the crisis. If there are not crises of this magnitude then I don't think the force of personality plays so important a role. So far as the political future of France is concerned, these crises are part of the past. Whatever crises are going to appear in the future will be of a different character, and the personality of de Gaulle would not have been fitting for those crises. For they have nothing to do with what has now been taken for granted.

reaction to registration report

The registration task force's proposed system for 1971-72 has met with the qualified approval of those who submitted briefs on the subject.

The recommendations, published last week in *Issues & Events*, are basically 1) a counselling period, beginning in winter, by members of faculty; 2) an enrolment period in June after exam results are available; 3) registration at the customary time.

History prof. Steve Scheinberg sees the proposal as "something that can work out pretty well." Faculty resignations, which could affect department timetables now required by January, should be minimal because of the non-expanding academic job market. He warns that not all professors that departments suggest as counsellors will be capable of giving the needed advice to students.

June Chaikelson, psychology, says the new scheme "can't be any worse than this year's." The same problem - non-availability of courses - remains, she says, but will now be handled in June rather than September. She hopes that students will still be prepared with a list of 5-10 desirable alternative courses.

John Jackson, sociology, says that the task force produced "a good system, vastly improved over last year's attempt, especially the distinction between enrolment and registration." He warns of difficulties over which registration has no control: the setting up of an effective counselling system; the "whole hornet's nest of problems" on a University admissions policy by discipline, another issue now being discussed.

Students' Association president Stuart Stuart says the report "solves a lot of problems" and more or less follows the SA's brief.

awards

Notices of financial aid are posted on the 4th floor bulletin boards of the Hall Building. Faculty awards will also be posted on the notice board in the Faculty Club. For more information and application forms (if available), see the Guidance Information Center, H-440-1.

P.E.O. INTERNATIONAL PEACE SCHOLARSHIP FUND (for female citizens of other countries to study in the U.S. or Canada). Deadline: Oct. 1 - Jan. 31. I.O.D.E. POST - GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS tenable in Commonwealth Countries. Deadline: Nov. 15.

KENT GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS (for study towards a Ph.D.). Deadline: Nov. 15.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE OF CANADA. Research Grants (students in final undergraduate year of Physics or Engineering are eligible). Deadline: Dec. 1.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY. Knox Memorial Fellowships. Deadline: Dec. 1.

FUND FOR THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION. Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowships in Religion. Deadline: Dec. 1.

McGILL UNIVERSITY. J.W. McConnell Memorial Fellowships for post-graduate study. Deadline: Dec. 1.

POPULATION COUNCIL. Fellowships in Demography. Deadline: Dec. 15.

DEPT. OF TRANSPORT. Meteorological Branch. Post-graduate fellowship in Meteorology and Atmospheric Sciences. Deadline: Dec. 15.

letters

In the light of your request for comments on the suggested University Code of Behaviour, we would like to inform you that The Working Women's Association of Sir George Williams University has submitted a four point brief to the University Council on the code.

Our brief requests two specific changes in the code and raises two more general questions arising from the code.

Specifically, we asked that sexual discrimination should be protected against in the same way as discrimination against race, colour, creed or ethnic origin.

We also pointed out that since clerical workers and part-time employees are covered by the disciplinary procedures of the code that they should have a voice in the establishment of appeal procedures. Precisely stated, this means that clerical workers and part-time faculty should be allowed to elect the same number of lawyers to the appeal body as the administration, SGWAUT, the SA, the ESA, and the GSA.

Next, we were concerned that clerical workers and part-time faculty members receive some job protection. The code clearly points out that there are established procedures for firing and for appeal against being fired for full time faculty and administrative members. We requested that either the code be expanded to include such situations or that a task force be set up immediately to rectify the situation.

Finally, we take exception to the definition of the University which the code states "is a community composed of three elements, faculty, students and administrators." We believe that all people whose job contributes to the general aims of the university should have their freedoms, rights and responsibilities made explicit. This means that the clerical workers, maintenance workers and cafeteria workers are vital to the total university community.

Dr. Christine Garside,
Working Women's Association
of SGWU

FACULTY AWARDS

CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. Residential Post-doctoral Fellowship Program. No specific deadline.

FOREIGN AREA FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM. a) W. Europe, deadline: Nov. 16; b) Soviet Union & Europe, deadline: Nov. 20; c) Latin America & Caribbean, deadline: Nov. 30.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE OF CANADA. Research Grants. Deadline: Dec. 1.

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION. Congressional Fellowships. Deadline: Dec. 1.

EXCHANGE OF RESEARCH SCHOLARS WITH FRANCE in the Social Sciences and Humanities. Deadline: Dec. 1.

ACLS RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS FOR FOREIGN SCHOLARS: Europe, deadline: Dec. 1.


ACLS GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON E. ASIA, S. ASIA. Deadline: Dec. 1.

NATO Research Fellowships. Deadline: Dec. 15.

BRITISH COUNCIL. Commonwealth University Interchange Scheme. Applications must be in London England by Dec. 15.

COMMONWEALTH FELLOWSHIP. St. John's College, Cambridge. Deadline: March 1.

Paris
Arnopoulos



YOUR PAPERS PLEASE!

Paris Arnopoulos, an active member of the New Democratic Party, is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science. Below, he gives his reactions to the proposed identification card, discussed recently by Justice Minister Jerome Choquette.

Do you think that the ID card proposal threatens civil liberties?

As a citizen, I would say "yes" it does. It's another step in the direction of having more control of citizens by the state. I don't think that it has been justified yet. First, the government hasn't proven that there was an insurrection, and since they haven't done that, I don't think it is justified. How far things have to go before it is justified is hard to say. I just don't believe we're that close to needing the ID card. On other hand France and other

European countries have had it for a long time. Now, you can say that France is a police state. But is France, because it is a police state, less free, in the broad sense, than we are? Even if they do have cards, you might find that France is freer in other areas than we are.

Is Justice Minister Choquette's argument valid - does it help him in any way?

I don't see how far it will help him. This is the one thing about the identity card - I think it is a political mistake on his part rather than something which will take away our civil liberties. I can't see that any loss of freedom - loss of anonymity and privacy - will give Choquette very much help. If he wanted more efficiency, he should put more money into the police budget to strengthen the police, rather than bring up a touchy thing like the proposed identity cards, causing a public outcry.

Do you think there is a public outcry?

By public, I mean the vocal part of the public, the intellectuals. The masses don't make an outcry about anything - no matter what the government does. It's the opposition syndrome, like the NDP or for that matter the Conservatives. In other words, it's the job of people like us to simply play the role of devil's advocate to the government: if the government says something, we must say "just a minute, is that good?" But I am sure that the majority of the population will go along with it.

How will opposition to the ID card proposal take form?

Well, before this comes to the debating point, Choquette will have to table a law in the house and say that the government is putting forth a bill for such and such - and then the debate will start. By then, it might be too late. In any case, it will be too late because a government of that size with the majority of people behind it will win, no matter what objections the minority might have. A newspaper editorial against it won't matter. But the government has to act now - while the iron is hot - because opposition will grow in six months' time. It has to be done now or not at all, unless the FLQ situation continues. And if the terrorism does continue the government will take more and more control measures, not to say suppressive measures, and the majority of the people will accept them. As it stands, I don't think that there will be any opposition mobilization - how do you mobilize? I don't think that people will march in the streets or march on Quebec. We have arrived at the situation where marches have lost their impact. In this time of politics of protest, everybody marches: so now, people are marching for the most silly thing to the most crucial issue. This has brought everything under a common denominator, losing impact. So we march to Quebec, and assuming it's non-violent, we present our petition and then go home. Do you think the government is going to respond to this? I don't think so. Then students and professors might go on strike but who cares? Let them strike.

What is the NDP position?

I don't think they have taken an official stand, yet. But I would think that they would be against the idea. The NDP probably hasn't taken a position yet for administrative reasons - they haven't met at this early stage. But even if it does take a position against, who cares? If the party did issue a statement, the papers wouldn't consider it to be important anyway.

It's useless to protest this kind of thing. I have to take it as just another of those forces of the times in which we are moving in. We are moving from the politics of the fifties when it was easy going - when politics was the specialty of just a few people in back rooms - to the po-

litics of "in-the-open", where a lot of people are participating. The pressures are mounting, everybody is pushing the government from all directions, all the way from the poor people to the women, the elites of the minorities and the elites of the minorities of minorities (sub-groups) - everyone is standing up for his rights and is no longer willing to keep silent. We are raising the level of conflict. Before everything was suppressed whereas now everyone is in the arena. Society before was simply not prepared to handle these problems, the so-called liberal democratic system was not prepared to handle these pressures. Once you raise the pressure, things like the inefficient police cannot cope. We have experienced just a handful of people almost bringing the system to a standstill. This shows what a small highly organized fanatic group can do to the liberal system. So this means that the liberal system cannot play with the "liberal rules", one of which was "you cannot be required to carry an ID card". Now the government is changing the rules because it feels the opposition is playing dirty. As one group raises the ante, the other group does and so forth, and we're getting higher and higher. I can see more than ID cards coming, but it depends on how the opposition acts to some extent.

Where does social legislation come in?

Well the government can do two things: it can give in or it can strengthen the defence wall. And it can do both. You give a little to the majority and at the same time you tighten your control. This seems the most likely thing. But social measures are a two-edged sword. The social measure itself requires control: everyone who has medicare must register with the government. We are full of cards. The action of objecting to the ID cards and at the same time demanding social legislation is misplaced, not to say a bit silly. We want the government to provide more services but the government has to know who the services are going to. There are very few people who, in one way or another, are not listed in government files. I mean we are so full of cards that we might as well have one master card that we can use for credit as well! To attack the ID card is just attacking the facade, not the real problem.

But the facade is a mug shot.

Well, I personally am not concerned because I think the government already has my fingerprints. Maybe this is one reason that I don't care that much. But, it's going to come either from the point of control measures or from social measures. The government can say we want to give you more so you will have to have the card. For instance, the government can just say that they are trying to avoid people collecting two welfare cheques. This kind of thing is inevitable - all the government is doing is shortening the time. Nineteen-eighty-four is only 14 years away. This would have happened regardless of the FLQ. If we assume that the government is no wiser than the society or the members of the society which it governs, I think we can say that the government acted as well as could be expected. I can't see what the alternative could be.

We are in an age when the government is just as much a slave of the system as the individual is. We are all caught up in forces beyond our control. I think the system has developed to such an extent that it can keep going on its own. Maybe it's a cancerous growth beyond our control. Whatever we do, we are more pushed into actions than actually initiating them ourselves. All the forces have captured us so that, now, we act more as automata than as decision-makers. The government has the same problem here as the individual. We have created a Frankenstein which is now out of our control. This is a world problem. ■

SGWU / THIS WEEK

thursday 12

BOARD OF GOVERNORS: Meeting at 1 p.m. in H-769.

PSYCHOLOGY CLUB: Movie "The 91st Day", 2:30 - 4 p.m. in H-110.

FRENCH 201 - SECTION TV: Channel 9 at 7 and 8:30 a.m., 10:30 p.m.

HISTORY SOCIETY: Meeting in H-511, 3 - 5 p.m.

BIOLOGY CLUB: Meeting at 1 p.m. in H-420.

PHILOSOPHY CLUB: Prof. Charles Taylor, department of philosophy, Université de Montréal and department of political science, McGill, will talk on "Socialism and Violence" at 2 p.m. in H-435.

CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART: Orson Welles' classic "Citizen Kane" at 8:30 p.m. in H-110; 50c for students; 75c non-students.

GEORGIAN CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP: Radical Theist Dave Ward will be under attack in H-635. from 11:45 a.m. to 1 p.m.

WEISSMAN GALLERY and GALLERY I: Fine Arts graduate student exhibition (in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of arts in art education) - Astrid Bhereur, Milo Freeman, Lawrence Kroon, Lise Cloutier-Lamarche, Marie Langlois, Billie Jo Mericle and Alice Lucy Yang until December 3.

friday 13

PHILOSOPHY COUNCIL: Meeting at 10:00 a.m. in H-1019.

E.S.A. FILM: "The Madwoman of Chaillot" at 8:30 p.m. in H-110; 99c.

SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF MANAGEMENT: Tour of the Molson Breweries at 3 p.m.; tickets available in N-025-6.

COMMERCE FACULTY COUNCIL: Meeting at 2 p.m. in H-769.

CARIBBEAN SOCIETY: Poetry meeting, 2 - 4:30 p.m. in H-420.

DROP IN THE BUCKET: Campaign to raise funds for poor children around the world; movies 12 - 5 p.m. in H-110.

saturday 14

E.S.A. FILM: "Fellini Satyricon" at 6 and 8 p.m. in H-110; 99c.

sunday 15

GEORGIAN FILM SOCIETY: "Tom Jones" at 7 and 9:30 p.m. in H-110.

monday 16

BOARD OF GRADUATE STUDIES: Meeting at 2 p.m. in H-769.

HILLEL: McGill prof. A Teitlebaum talks on Hasidism at 8:30 p.m., 2130 Bishop.

GARNET SINGERS: Meeting 5 - 6 p.m. in H-513; everyone welcome.

S.G.W.U. RIDING CLUB: Meeting to discuss riding lessons at 5:15 p.m. in the Athletics office, 2160 Bishop.

tuesday 17

HILLEL: Barry Luger, Rochdale survivor and York University prof. talks on "Everything's Right On Time" at 2 p.m. in H-435.

WORKING WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF S.G.W.U.: Meeting at noon in H-615.

FRENCH 201 - SECTION TV: Cable TV's channel 9 at 7 and 8:30 a.m., 10:30 p.m.

GEORGIAN PLAYERS: "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead", directed by Gary Plaxton, 8:30 p.m. in the Douglass Burns Clarke Theatre; \$1.50/\$2.00.

AIESEC: Membership meeting at 4 p.m. in H-609.

wednesday 18

HILLEL: Living theatre workshop and beginners folk guitar at 7 p.m., 2130 Bishop.

GEORGIAN PLAYERS: "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead" directed by Gary Plaxton, 8:30 p.m. in the Douglass Burns Clarke Theatre; \$1.50/\$2.00.

AFRICAN SOCIETY: Movies "Black and White in South Africa Today" and "Developing Nations of Africa" from 5 to 6:15 p.m. in H-420; free.

GEORGIAN MARKETING SOCIETY: Larry Chaisson, Expos' director of publicity will talk on "How the Expos were sold to Montreal" at 5:30 p.m. in room 26 of the YMCA.

thursday 19

CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART: "The Horse's Mouth" (1959) with Alec Guinness, at 7:00 p.m.; "I'm all Right Jack" (1959), with Peter Sellers, at 9:00 p.m. in H-110; 50c for students, 75c non-students.

GEORGIAN PLAYERS: "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead", directed by Gary Plaxton, 8:30 p.m. in the Douglass Burns B. Clarke Theatre; \$1.50/\$2.00.

BIOLOGY CLUB: Meeting at 1 p.m. in H-420.

FRENCH 201 - SECTION TV: Channel 9 at 7 and 8:30 a.m., 10:30 p.m.

NOTICE

Deadline for submission of honorary degree nominations for 1971 is December 1. Send short biography and rationale to the Registrar, N-108-4.

Send notices and photos of coming events to the information office, room 211 of the Norris Building, or phone 879-2867. Deadline for submission is noon **Wednesday** for events the following Thursday through Wednesday.



Students of politics, journalism, William Randolph Hearst, Orson Welles and cinema must not miss "Citizen Kane," the Conservatory of Cinematographic Art's show this Thursday.

ISSUES & EVENTS

ISSUES & EVENTS is published weekly by the Information Office of Sir George Williams University. Editorial offices are located in room 211 of the Norris Building, 1435 Drummond Street, Montreal 107 (879-2867). Litho by Journal Offset Inc., 254 Benjamin-Hudon, Ville St. Laurent.

Joel McCormick, editor
Michael Sheldon
Malcolm Stone

